

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Response Card Marketing, Inc.	)	File No. EB-06-TC-421
	)	
Apparent Liability for Forfeiture	)	NAL/Acct. No. 200832170045
	)	FRN: 0017629833
	)	
	)	

**NOTICE OF APPARENT LIABILITY FOR FORFEITURE**

**Adopted: April 4, 2008**

**Released: April 4, 2008**

By the Chief, Enforcement Bureau:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In this *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture* ("NAL")<sup>1</sup>, we find that Response Card Marketing, Inc. ("Response Card Marketing")<sup>2</sup> apparently willfully or repeatedly violated section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("Act"), and the Commission's related rules and orders, by delivering two unsolicited advertisements to the telephone facsimile machine of at least one consumer.<sup>3</sup> Based on the facts and circumstances surrounding these apparent violations, we find that Response Card Marketing is apparently liable for a forfeiture in the amount of \$9,000.

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(1). The Commission has the authority under this section of the Act to assess a forfeiture against any person who has "willfully or repeatedly failed to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Commission under this Act ...." See also 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(5) (stating that the Commission has the authority under this section of the Act to assess a forfeiture penalty against any person who is not a common carrier so long as such person (A) is first issued a citation of the violation charged; (B) is given a reasonable opportunity for a personal interview with an official of the Commission, at the field office of the Commission nearest to the person's place of residence; and (C) subsequently engages in conduct of the type described in the citation).

<sup>2</sup> According to publicly available information, Response Card Marketing Inc. is also doing business as Response Card Marketing. Therefore, all references in this NAL to Response Card Marketing encompass Response Card Marketing Inc. as well as Response Card Marketing. Response Card Marketing has offices at 2 E. Blackwell St., Dover, NJ 07801 and 16 Pierson Drive, Andover, NJ 07821. Dennis Gordon, President and owner, is listed as the contact person for Response Card Marketing. Accordingly, all references in this NAL to "Response Card Marketing Company" also encompass the foregoing individual and all other principals and officers of this entity, as well as the corporate entity itself.

<sup>3</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(C); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(3); see also *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Report and Order and Third Order on Reconsideration*, 21 FCC Rcd 3787 (2006).

## II. BACKGROUND

2. Section 227(b)(1)(C) of the Act makes it “unlawful for any person within the United States, or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States . . . to use any telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to send, to a telephone facsimile machine, an unsolicited advertisement.”<sup>4</sup> The term “unsolicited advertisement” is defined in the Act and the Commission’s rules as “any material advertising the commercial availability or quality of any property, goods, or services which is transmitted to any person without that person’s prior express invitation or permission in writing or otherwise.”<sup>5</sup> Under the Commission’s rules, an “established business relationship”<sup>6</sup> exception permits a party to deliver a message to a consumer if the sender has an established business relationship with the recipient *and* the sender obtained the number of the facsimile machine through the voluntary communication by the recipient, directly to the sender, within the context of the established business relationship, or through a directory, advertisement, or a site on the Internet to which the recipient voluntarily agreed to make available its facsimile number for public distribution.<sup>7</sup>

3. On September 12, 2006, in response to one or more consumer complaints alleging that Response Card Marketing had faxed unsolicited advertisements, the Enforcement Bureau (“Bureau”) issued a citation<sup>8</sup> to Response Card Marketing, pursuant to section 503(b)(5) of the Act.<sup>9</sup> The Bureau cited Response Card Marketing for using a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device, to send unsolicited advertisements for insurance products to a telephone facsimile machine, in violation of section 227 of the Act and the Commission’s related rules and orders. The citation, which was served by certified mail, return receipt requested, warned Response Card Marketing that subsequent violations could result in the imposition of monetary forfeitures of up to \$11,000 per violation, and included a copy of the consumer complaints that formed the basis of the citation.<sup>10</sup> The citation informed Response Card Marketing that within 30 days of the date of the citation, it could either request an interview with Commission staff, or could provide a written statement responding to the citation. Response Card Marketing did not request an interview or otherwise respond to the citation.

4. Despite the citation’s warning that subsequent violations could result in the imposition of monetary forfeitures, we have received additional consumer complaints indicating that Response Card Marketing continued to engage in such conduct after receiving the citation.<sup>11</sup> We base our action here specifically on two complaints filed by a consumer establishing that Response Card Marketing continued

---

<sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(C); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(3).

<sup>5</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(4); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (f)(13).

<sup>6</sup> An “established business relationship” is defined as a prior or existing relationship formed by a voluntary two-way communication “with or without an exchange of consideration, on the basis of an inquiry, application, purchase or transaction by the business or residential subscriber regarding products or services offered by such person or entity, which relationship has not been previously terminated by either party.” 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(5).

<sup>7</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(C); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(3)(i), (ii).

<sup>8</sup> Citation from Kurt A. Schroeder, Deputy Chief, Telecommunications Consumers Division, Enforcement Bureau, File No. EB-07-TC-421 issued to Response Card Marketing on September 12, 2006. Due to an administrative error, this citation was mailed out referring to File No. EB-07-TC-421. The correct File No. is EB-06-TC-421.

<sup>9</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(5) (authorizing the Commission to issue citations to non-common carriers for violations of the Act or of the Commission’s rules and orders).

<sup>10</sup> Commission staff mailed the citation to 2 E. Blackwell St., Dover, NJ 07801. See n.2, *supra*.

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix for a listing of the consumer complaint against Response Card Marketing requesting Commission action.

to send unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines after the date of the citation.<sup>12</sup>

5. Section 503(b) of the Act authorizes the Commission to assess a forfeiture of up to \$11,000 for each violation of the Act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Commission under the Act by a non-common carrier or other entity not specifically designated in section 503 of the Act.<sup>13</sup> In exercising such authority, we are to take into account “the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation and, with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, and such other matters as justice may require.”<sup>14</sup>

### III. DISCUSSION

#### A. Violations of the Commission’s Rules Restricting Unsolicited Facsimile Advertisements

6. We find that Response Card Marketing apparently violated section 227 of the Act and the Commission’s related rules and orders by using a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to send at least one unsolicited advertisement to the consumer identified in the Appendix. This NAL is based on evidence that a consumer received unsolicited fax advertisements from Response Card Marketing *after* the Bureau’s citation. The facsimile transmissions advertise insurance products. Further, according to the complaints, the consumer neither had an established business relationship with Response Card Marketing nor gave Response Card Marketing permission to send the facsimile transmission.<sup>15</sup> The faxes at issue here therefore fall within the definition of an “unsolicited advertisement.”<sup>16</sup> Based on the entire record, including the consumer complaints, we conclude that Response Card Marketing apparently violated section 227 of the Act and the Commission’s related rules and orders by sending unsolicited advertisements to a consumer’s facsimile machine.

#### B. Proposed Forfeiture

7. We find that Response Card Marketing is apparently liable for a forfeiture in the amount of \$9,000. Although the *Commission’s Forfeiture Policy Statement* does not establish a base forfeiture amount for violating the prohibition against using a telephone facsimile machine to send unsolicited advertisements, the Commission has previously considered \$4,500 per unsolicited fax advertisement to be

---

<sup>12</sup> We note that evidence of additional instances of unlawful conduct by Response Card Marketing may form the basis of subsequent enforcement action.

<sup>13</sup> Section 503(b)(2)(C) provides for forfeitures up to \$10,000 for each violation in cases not covered by subparagraph (A) or (B), which address forfeitures for violations by licensees and common carriers, among others. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 503(b). In accordance with the inflation adjustment requirements contained in the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-134, Sec. 31001, 110 Stat. 1321, the Commission implemented an increase of the maximum statutory forfeiture under section 503(b)(2)(C) to \$11,000. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(b)(3); *Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Commission’s Rules and Adjustment of Forfeiture Maxima to Reflect Inflation*, 15 FCC Rcd 18221 (2000); *see also Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission’s Rules and Adjustment of Forfeiture Maxima to Reflect Inflation*, 19 FCC Rcd 10945 (2004) (this recent amendment of section 1.80(b) to reflect inflation left the forfeiture maximum for this type of violator at \$11,000).

<sup>14</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(D); *The Commission’s Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines, Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 17087, 17100-01 para. 27 (1997) (*Forfeiture Policy Statement*), *recon. denied*, 15 FCC Rcd 303 (1999).

<sup>15</sup> *See, e.g.*, complaint dated May 29, 2007, from Connie Stinnett (stating that she has never purchased anything from the company being advertised in the fax or made an inquiry or application to the company or given consent for the company to send the fax.). The complainant involved in this action is listed in the Appendix below.

<sup>16</sup> *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(4); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(13) (definition previously at § 64.1200(f)(10)).

an appropriate base amount.<sup>17</sup> We apply that base amount to these apparent violations. Thus, a total forfeiture of \$9,000 is proposed. Response Card Marketing will have the opportunity to submit evidence and arguments in response to this NAL to show that no forfeiture should be imposed or that some lesser amount should be assessed.<sup>18</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND ORDERING CLAUSES

8. We have determined that Response Card Marketing, Inc. apparently violated section 227 of the Act and the Commission's related rules and orders by using a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to send two unsolicited advertisements to the consumer identified in the Appendix. We have further determined that Response Card Marketing, Inc. is apparently liable for a forfeiture in the amount of \$9,000.

9. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to section 503(b) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 503(b), and section 1.80 of the rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.80, and under the authority delegated by sections 0.111 and 0.311 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.111, 0.311, that Response Card Marketing, Inc. is hereby NOTIFIED of this APPARENT LIABILITY FOR A FORFEITURE in the amount of \$9,000 for willful or repeated violations of section 227(b)(1)(C) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(C), sections 64.1200(a)(3) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(3), and the related orders described in the paragraphs above.

10. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT, pursuant to section 1.80 of the Commission's rules,<sup>19</sup> within thirty (30) days of the release date of this *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture*, Response Card Marketing, Inc. SHALL PAY the full amount of the proposed forfeiture or SHALL FILE a written statement seeking reduction or cancellation of the proposed forfeiture.

11. Payment of the forfeiture must be made by check or similar instrument, payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission. The payment must include the NAL/Account Number and FRN Number referenced above. Payment by check or money order may be mailed to Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979088, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000. Payment by overnight mail may be sent to U.S. Bank – Government Lockbox #979088, SL-MO-C2-GL, 1005 Convention Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63101. Payment[s] by wire transfer may be made to ABA Number 021030004, receiving bank TREAS/NYC, and account number 27000001. For payment by credit card, an FCC Form 159 (Remittance Advice) must be submitted. When completing the FCC Form 159, enter the NAL/Account number in block number 23A (call sign/other ID), and enter the letters "FORF" in block number 24A (payment type code). Requests for full payment under an installment plan should be sent to: Chief Financial Officer -- Financial Operations, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1-A625, Washington, D.C. 20554. Please contact the Financial Operations Group Help Desk at 1-877-480-3201 or Email: ARINQUIRIES@fcc.gov with any questions regarding payment procedures.

12. The response, if any, must be mailed both to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554, ATTN: Enforcement Bureau – Telecommunications Consumers Division, and to Colleen Heitkamp, Chief,

<sup>17</sup> See *Get-Aways, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability For Forfeiture, 15 FCC Rcd 1805 (1999); *Get-Aways, Inc.*, Forfeiture Order, 15 FCC Rcd 4843 (2000); see also *US Notary, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 15 Rcd 16999 (2000); *US Notary, Inc.*, Forfeiture Order, 16 FCC Rcd 18398 (2001); *Tri-Star Marketing, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability For Forfeiture, 15 FCC Rcd 11295 (2000); *Tri-Star Marketing, Inc.*, Forfeiture Order, 15 FCC Rcd 23198 (2000).

<sup>18</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(4)(C); 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(f)(3).

<sup>19</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.80.

Telecommunications Consumers Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554, and must include the NAL/Acct. No. referenced in the caption.

13. The Commission will not consider reducing or canceling a forfeiture in response to a claim of inability to pay unless the petitioner submits: (1) federal tax returns for the most recent three-year period; (2) financial statements prepared according to generally accepted accounting practices; or (3) some other reliable and objective documentation that accurately reflects the petitioner's current financial status. Any claim of inability to pay must specifically identify the basis for the claim by reference to the financial documentation submitted.

14. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture* shall be sent by Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to Response Card Marketing, Inc., 2 E. Blackwell St., Dover, NJ 07801 and 16 Pierson Drive, Andover, NJ 07821, Attention: Dennis Gordon, President.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kris Anne Monteith  
Chief, Enforcement Bureau

**APPENDIX**

<b>Complainant sent facsimile solicitations</b>	<b>Violation Date(s)</b>
Stinnett, Connie	5/29/07, 8/21/07